

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

February 19, 1998 LB 309

PRESIDENT ROBAK: Chair recognizes Senator Beutler to open on the amendment to the first division of the committee amendments.

SENATOR BEUTLER: Lieutenant Governor Robak, members of the Legislature, Senator Bromm, this amendment, members of the Legislature, relates to the amendment that we had yesterday. You may recall when there was a 20-16 vote to reduce the penalty, on a first conviction, from \$500 to \$300, so that there would be a \$100 increase instead of a \$300 increase. And Senator Matzke had some objection to that. What I've done then is to make that increase a little bit more, and yet make the increase...make the penalty greater for third offense convictions, so that you have the graduated structure that we discussed yesterday, which is so important to concepts of justice where you have greater penalties for second and third time convictions. And the way that the law would read with this amendment would be as follows--the first conviction, the penalty, the mandatory minimum fine, instead of being \$200 would be \$400, and that would be less than the \$100 (sic) that is...less than the \$500 that is currently proposed as a change in the bill, in the amendment, in the committee amendment. So the fine for the first conviction would be \$400; for the second conviction it would be \$500, that's no change at all; and then for the third conviction, instead of being \$500 for the mandatory minimum fine, it would be \$600. So that you would have the normal kind of progression that we have in criminal cases where the first conviction the fine would be \$400, the second conviction the fine would be 500, and the third conviction it would be 600, increasingly heavy as the number of convictions increase. Hopefully, this is a reasonable compromise with Senator Matzke's point of view. It serves the purpose of making at least some difference between the maximum fine, which is \$500, and the mandatory minimum fine, which would be 400 then instead of 500. If you remember, if you left things the way they are, the difference would be...between the maximum fine and the minimum fine would be no dollars at all, there is no difference. So Senator Bromm was amenable to the previous amendment, I assume he would be amenable to this, because it is less of a change, and the third conviction is actually a greater fine. So, hopefully, this moves on to some additional common ground that we all have. Thank you.